



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,577	06/14/2001	Toru Hiraoka	81800.0159	9601

26021 7590 03/14/2005
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.
500 S. GRAND AVENUE
SUITE 1900
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-2611

EXAMINER

HUNTSINGER, PETER K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/882,577

Applicant(s)

HIRAOKA, TORU

Examiner

Peter K. Huntsinger

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/14/01, 1/6/03
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 9-11, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chari et al. U.S. 6,553,416.

Referring to claims 1, 9, and 16, Chari et al. disclose a network using SNMP (col. 4, lines 41-50) comprising: storage means for storing information to be managed by a management machine (col. 7, lines 25-30); determination means for determining whether or not the information stored in the storage means should be sent to the management machine on the basis of the information stored in the storage means (col. 3, lines 21-23); and transmission means for sending the information to the management

Art Unit: 2624

machine when the determination means determines that the information should be sent to the management machine (col. 7, lines 30-35).

Referring to claims 2, 10, and 17, Chari et al. disclose reception means for receiving an information transmission request from the management machine such that the transmission means sends the information to the management machine in compliance with the transmission request received by the reception means (col. 3, lines 16-18).

Referring to claims 4, 11, and 18, Chari et al. disclose information stored in the storage means is MIB information (col. 9, lines 26-30).

Referring to claim 19, Chari et al. disclose the computer belonging to a network apparatus and the information to be managed is machine conditions of the network apparatus (Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 24-37).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 5, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chari et al. U.S. 6,553,416.

Referring to claim 3, Chari et al. disclose storage means is a single hardware for storing information related to the respective functions to be managed by the

Art Unit: 2624

management machine (alert manager 202 of Fig. 2, col. 8, lines 29-32). Chari et al. does not disclose expressly a network having at least two of a copy function, an image scan function, an image print function and a facsimile function. Chari et al. disclose having printers and other peripheral devices connected to the network (col. 1, lines 48-51). Official Notice is taken that it is well known and obvious in the art for copiers, scanners, printers, and fax machines to be connected to a network. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow many users share access to scanners, printers, and fax machines. Therefore, it would have been obvious to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

Referring to claims 5 and 12, Chari et al. disclose a network and having printers and other peripheral devices connected to the network (col. 1, lines 48-51), but does not disclose expressly a copy-facsimile machine and the information stored in the storage means relates to machine conditions of the copy-facsimile machine. Official Notice is taken that it is well known and obvious in the art for a copier/fax machine to be connected to a network. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow many users share access to a copy-facsimile machine and a copy-facsimile machine is a generic type of peripheral device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5 and 12.

6. Claims 6, 8, 13, 15, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chari et al. U.S. 6,553,416 as applied to claims 5 and 12 above, and further in view of Allen et al. U.S. 5,404,532.

Referring to claims 6 and 13, Chari et al. disclose a network monitoring system but do not disclose expressly the determination means determines that the information should be sent to the management machine when a particular part in the copy-facsimile machine should be replaced with a new one. Allen et al. disclose determining that information should be sent to the management machine when a part needs to be replaced (Fig. 2, col. 3, lines 49-63). Chari et al. and Allen et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of network monitoring systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to alert the management machine of Chari et al. when a part needs replaced. The motivation for doing so would have been to notify a person capable of replacing the part needed to allow the device to perform correctly. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Allen et al. with Chari et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims 6 and 13.

Referring to claims 8 and 15, Chari et al. disclose a network monitoring system but do not disclose expressly the determination means determines that the information should be sent to the management machine when a serious event occurs in the copy-facsimile machine. Allen et al. disclose determining that information should be sent to the management machine when a significant occurs (Fig. 2, col. 3, lines 49-63). Chari et al. and Allen et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of network monitoring systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to alert the management machine of Chari et al. when a significant event occurs. The motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the communication workload by only sending a notification when it is necessary. Therefore,

it would have been obvious to combine Allen et al. with Chari et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims 8 and 15.

Referring to claim 20, Chari et al. disclose a network monitoring system but do not disclose expressly the computer determines that the information should be sent to the management machine when a particular part in the network apparatus should be replaced with a new one. Allen et al. disclose determining that information should be sent to the management machine when a part needs replaced (Fig. 2, col. 3, lines 49-63). Chari et al. and Allen et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of network monitoring systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to alert the management machine of Chari et al. when a part needs replaced. The motivation for doing so would have been to notify a person capable of replacing the part needed to allow the device to perform correctly. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Allen et al. with Chari et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

7. Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chari et al. U.S. 6,553,416 as applied to claims 5 and 12 above, and further in view of Yamazaki et al. U.S. 6,400,466.

Referring to claims 7 and 14, Chari et al. disclose a network monitoring system but do not disclose expressly the determination means determines that the information should not be sent to the management machine when a user is able to repair a trouble in the copy-facsimile machine. Yamazaki et al. disclose determining means capable of

Art Unit: 2624

determining whether a user is able to repair a peripheral device (Fig. 5, col. 10, lines 9-13). Chari et al. and Yamazaki et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of computer networking with peripheral devices. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to determine whether a user can repair a peripheral device and alert the system if they cannot. The motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the communication workload by only sending a notification when a device cannot be repaired by the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yamazaki et al. with Chari et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7 and 14.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter K. Huntsinger whose telephone number is (703)306-4088. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (703)308-7452. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PKH

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'P' followed by a long, sweeping horizontal line that extends to the right.